

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03141 01 OF 02 082029Z

67

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20

DRC-01 /161 W

----- 005809

R 081626Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2380

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 VIENNA 3141

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO BE USED  
BY NETHERLANDS REP QUARLES

FOLLOWING IS TEXT OF CONTINGENCY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
TO BE USED BY NETHERLANDS REP QUARLES AT PRESS CONFERENCE  
APRIL 10, AS APPROVED BY AD HOC GROUP APRIL 5.

BEGIN TEXT:

1. QUESTION: DO YOU EXPECT ANY KIND OF BREAKTHROUGH TO TAKE  
PLACE IN THE NEAR FUTURE? ANSWER: WE CAN'T MAKE PREDICTIONS.  
THESE ARE COMPLICATED NEGOTIATIONS. WE ARE NOT PESSIMISTIC  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03141 01 OF 02 082029Z

ABOUT LONG-RANGE PROSPECTS.

2. QUESTION: YOU LISTED SOME POINTS OF COMMON GROUND. DOES THE EAST AGREE WITH YOUR DISCRIPTION OF THESE POINTS?  
ANSWER: I DO NOT PRETEND TO SPEAK FOR THE EASTERN DELEGATES. HOWEVER, THERE APPEARS LITTLE DOUBT THAT THERE ARE SOME COMMON POINTS IN THE POSITIONS OF BOTH SIDES. WE HOPE THEY CAN BE BUILT ON.

3. QUESTION: ON THE TWO MAIN ISSUES YOU YOURSELF HAVE DESCRIBED -- REDUCTION OF EUROPEAN FORCES, AND INCLUSION OF AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES -- THE TWO SIDES APPEAR TO HAVE DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED POSITIONS. DOESN'T THIS MEAN THE TALKS ARE STALEMATED?  
ANSWER: WE DON'T BELIEVE THAT ANY OF THE PARTICIPANTS THINK OF THE TALKS AS BEING IN A STATE OF STALEMATE.

4. QUESTION: IS IT TRUE THAT WESTERN EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS ARE NOT WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN REDUCTIONS? ANSWER: NO, NONE OF THEM HAS SAID THIS. NEGOTIATIONS ON THEIR PARTICIPATION IN REDUCTIONS WOULD TAKE PLACE IN PHASE II.

5. QUESTION: WILL ALL WEST EUROPEANS REDUCE? ANSWER: IF AGREEMENT IS REACHED ON THE COMMON CEILING, I CAN ASSURE YOU THE ALLIES WILL MAKE THEIR FULL CONTRIBUTION.

6. QUESTION: WILL THE WEST CONTINUE TO REFUSE TO CONSIDER REDUCTION OF AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES? ANSWER: WE THINK OUR POSITION IS JUSTIFIED. SUCH REDUCTIONS DON'T DEAL WITH THE ROOT PROBLEM IN THE AREA. THEY WOULD BE MISLEADING AS TO WHAT HAD BEEN ACCOMPLISHED.

7. QUESTION: DO YOU THINK THE EAST AT SOME POINT ARE GOING TO DROP THEIR DEMAND FOR REDUCTION OF AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES? ANSWER: I CAN'T ANSWER THAT. WE THINK WE HAVE PRESENTED GOOD REASONS WHY THEY SHOULD DO SO.

8. QUESTION: AREN'T YOU JUST ASKING THE EASTERN SIDE SIMPLY TO BUY YOUR WHOLE POSITION? AND, ISN'T THE EASTERN SIDE ASKING YOU TO BUY ITS WHOLE POSITION? THIS BEING SO, HOW WOULD YOU EXPECT PROGRESS TO BE MADE? ANSWER: THAT'S A NATURAL BEGINNING IN ANY NEGOTIATION. BOTH SIDES BELIEVE THEIR PROPOSALS ARE FAIR, EQUITABLE, AND THE BEST. BOTH SIDES WISH  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03141 01 OF 02 082029Z

TO FULLY EXPLAIN AND TRY TO CONVINCE THE OTHER SIDE OF THE SOUNDNESS OF THEIR APPROACH. HOWEVER, BOTH SIDES HAVE EXHIBITED THEIR WILLINGNESS TO SEARCH FOR COMMON GROUND.

9. QUESTION: YOU SAID IN YOUR STATEMENT THAT YOU ARE OPPOSED TO SMALL REDUCTIONS OF EUROPEAN FORCES FROM THE OUTSET, OR SMALL REDUCTIONS OF AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES. IS THIS WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE ASKING FOR?

ANSWER: IT WOULD NOT BE PROPER FOR ME TO REVEAL THE DETAILS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. SOME PROPOSALS WERE MADE LAST FALL FOR SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS OF ALL PARTICIPANTS AND ALL FORCES ON BOTH SIDES. ON THE WESTERN SIDE WE CONSIDER SUCH REDUCTIONS TO BE UNSATISFACTORY. FIRST, THEY WOULD ENSHRINE THE PRESENT INEQUITABLE RELATIONSHIP OF GROUND FORCES. SECOND, THEY WOULD REQUIRE PARTICIPATION FROM THE OUTSET OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. FINALLY, THEY WOULD INCLUDE AIR AND NUCLEAR REDUCTIONS.

10. QUESTION: YOU SAY THAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SERIOUS ABOUT THESE NEGOTIATIONS. BUT APPARENTLY THEY HAVE PUT FORWARD POSITIONS WHICH ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE TO YOU. WHAT CONVINCES YOU THEY ARE SERIOUS? ANSWER: THERE A NUMBER OF REASONS. THE FACT THAT THE EAST IS HERE IN VIENNA, NEGOTIATING WITH US, IS ONE REASON. THEY PUT DOWN CONCRETE PROPOSALS EARLY IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THEY HAVE PUBLICLY STATED THEIR INTEREST IN REACHING EARLY AGREEMENT, AND BEGINNING IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTIONS IN 1975. THEY HAVE BEEN BUSINESSLIKE AND HAVE AVOIDED POLEMICS. FINALLY, THEY APPEAR GENUINELY TO BE SEEKING COMMON SOLUTIONS.

11. QUESTION: THE SUBJECT OF THE NEGOTIATIONS INCLUDES "ASSOCIATED MEASURES." YOU DIDN'T MENTION THEM IN YOUR STATEMENT. HOW ARE THE DISCUSSIONS ON THEM COMING ALONG?

ANSWER: IT WAS NOT AN INTENDED OVERSIGHT. CERTAIN ASSOCIATED MEASURES ARE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL FOR REDUCTIONS. WE HAVE DISCUSSED ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS SUCH SUBJECTS AS STABILIZING MEASURES, VERIFICATIONS, NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSES, ETC. BOTH SIDES AGREED AT THE PRELIMINARY CONSULTATIONS THAT ASSOCIATED MEASURES WOULD BE A TOPIC AT OUR NEGOTIATIONS AND THEY HAVE BEEN. AS TO THEIR PROGRESS, MOST SUCH MEASURES ARE AFFECTED SUBSTANTIALLY THE SHAPE AND SIZE OF THE REDUCTIONS PACKAGE.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03141 01 OF 02 082029Z

12. QUESTION: HOW IS THE ACTUAL BUSINESS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS BEING CONDUCTED? SURELY NOT JUST IN THE PLENARIES?

ANSWER: FROM THE OUTSET, WE HAVE SUPPLEMENTED PLENARIES WITH INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS. THESE ARE BOTH BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL.

13. QUESTION: YOU HAVE IMPLIED YOU ARE MAKING SOME HEADWAY IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, YET THE NUMBER OF PLENARY MEETINGS HAS BEEN CUT BACK TO ONE A WEEK. HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THIS?

ANSWER: THE PLENARY SCHEDULE IS NOT A FIRM ONE. WE HAVE ONE WHENEVER BOTH SIDES FEEL IT IS USEFUL.

14. QUESTION: IS IT TRUE THAT THREE REPRESENTATIVES FROM EACH SIDE HAVE BEEN MEETING ONCE OR TWICE EVERY WEEK TO NEGOTIATE ON BEHALF OF THEIR RESPECTIVE ALLIES? ANSWER: IT IS TRUE THAT THERE HAVE BEEN INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE SIDES FROM THE

OUTSET. WE HAVE FOUND THIS ONE OF THE USEFUL WAYS FOR DISCUSSING THE SUBJECT MATTER IN MORE DETAIL.

15. QUESTION: IS IT TRUE THAT THERE ARE SOME PARTICIPANTS, ON BOTH SIDES, WHO ARE UNHAPPY ABOUT THE CURRENT NEGOTIATING PROCEDURE INVOLVING THREE REPRESENTATIVES ON EACH SIDE?

ANSWER: I CAN, OF COURSE, ONLY SPEAK FOR THE WEST. ON OUR SIDE, NO ONE IS UNHAPPY ABOUT THE WAY IN WHICH THE NEGOTIATIONS ARE BEING CONDUCTED.

16. QUESTION: IS IT TRUE THE ROMANIANS HAVE THREATENED TO WALK OUT BECAUSE THEY ARE EXCLUDED FROM THE INFORMAL NEGOTIATING SESSIONS? ANSWER: NO, THEY HAVE NOT INDICTED THIS TO US.

17. QUESTION: WILL THESE INFORMAL NEGOTIATING SESSIONS BE CONTINUED AFTER THE EASTER BREAK? ANSWER: AFTER THE EASTER BREAK I EXPECT US TO USE ANY FORUM WHICH ENABLES US TO BEST MOVE THE NEGOTIATIONS ALONG.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03141 02 OF 02 081922Z

67

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20

DRC-01 /161 W

----- 004858

R 081626Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2381

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY BONN

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 VIENNA 3141

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

18. QUESTION: WHAT IMPACT HAS MR. KISSINGER'S VISIT TO MOSCOW HAD ON YOUR NEGOTIATIONS?

ANSWER: IT APPEARS THAT AMONG A WIDE RANGE OF OTHER SUBJECTS MR. KISSINGER DID DISCUSS MBFR WITH THE SOVIET LEADERS. IT IS TOO EARLY TO MEASURE ANY SPECIFIC IMPACT AS YET. AS FAR AS I KNOW, DISCUSSION OF THIS ISSUE WAS NOT VERY EXTENSIVE.

19. QUESTION: HOW DO YOU EXPECT THE US/SOVIET SUMMIT MEETING, ANTICIPATED IN JUNE, TO AFFECT THE NEGOTIATIONS? WILL MBFR BE DISCUSSED THERE?

ANSWER: I WOULD EXPECT THAT MBFR WILL CERTAINLY BE ONE OF THE TOPICS DISCUSSED DURING THE NIXON VISIT  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03141 02 OF 02 081922Z

TO THE USSR. HOW THAT VISIT MIGHT AFFECT OUR TALKS WOULD NOW BE PURELY SPECULATIVE.

20. QUESTION: IF THERE IS NO US/SOVIET SALT AGAAREEMENT THIS YEAR, WILL THAT HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON YOUR NEGOTIATIONS?

ANSWER: THESE ARE COMPLETELY SEPARATE NEGOTIATIONS. HOWEVER, IF THE SALT NEGOTIATIONS FAILED, THIS WOULD HAVE A GENERAL POLITICAL EFFECT.

21. QUESTION: DO YOU THINK THE HARD LINE THE RUSSIANS APPEAR TO BE TAKING ON MBFR IS BASED ON THE CALCULATION THAT PRESIDENT NISON HAS BEEN SERIOUSLY WEAKENED BY WATERGATE?

ANSWER: THE QUESTION ASSUMES THE RUSSIANS HAVE TAKEN A HARD LINE ON MBFR. WHILE THEY DO HAVE A FIRM POSITION, THEY ARE, AS I SAID, SERIOUS, BUSINESSLIKE, AND HAVE DEMONSTRATED AN INTEREST IN REACHING AGREEMENT. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT WATERGATE HAS HAD ANY EFFECT ON THE TALKS.

22. QUESTION: WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE NEGOTIATIONS IF THE US CONGRESS SIMPLY LEGISLATES UNILATERAL REDUCTIONS OF US TROOPS IN EUROPE?

ANSWER: I THINK THAT SUCH AN ACTION WOULD SERIOUSLY UNDERMINE OUR NEGOTIATIONS. I DO NOT EXPECT IT TO HAPPEN.

23. QUESTION: THE SOVIETS WANT TO CONCLUDE THE CSCE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. WOULD ANY DECISIONS MADE IN GENEVA INFLUENCE THE MBFR TALKS?

ANSWER: I THINK A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION TO CSCE WOULD BE HELPFUL -- IT WOULD CERTAINLY BE A CONCRETE EXAMPLE THAT MIDDLE GROUND CAN BE FOUND TO EUROPEAN PROBLEMS. CSCE DOES NOT SIGNIFICANTLY OVERLAP WITH MBFR. DECISIONS ON CBM'S IN GENEVA COULD ALSO IMPACT ON SOME OF OUR ISSUES HERE.  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03141 02 OF 02 081922Z

24. QUESTION: WILL YOU CONTINUE TO ADHERE TO THE CONFIDENTIALITY RULE VIS-A-VIS THE MEDIA, PARTICULARLY SINCE THE EASTERN SIDE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEAKING DETAILS ON THE NEGOTIATIONS?

ANSWER: YES, WE THINK THE CONFIDENTIALITY RULE IS A GOOD ONE AND WE SEE NO ADVANTAGES IN ANY PROPAGANDA CONTEST OVER THE ISSUES WE ARE ADDRESSING HERE. I THINK THE EAST WILL GENERALLY ABIDE BY THE RULE ALSO. I HOPE SO.

25. QUESTION: NATO HAS CELEBRATED ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS INDICATE THAT THE WARSAW PACT WILL PERPETUATE ITSELF. EVEN IF MBFR SUCCEEDS, IS IT NOT A FACT THAT THE BLOC MILITARY CONFRONTATION WILL CONTINUE FOR A LONG TIME?

ANSWER: I THINK THE WARSAW PACT AND NATO WILL BOTH BE WITH US FOR SOME TIME TO COME. NATO HAS CERTAINLY PROVEN ITSELF A USEFUL AND DURABLE ORGANIZATION AND NOT ONLY IN THE SECURITY FIELD. WE HOPE TO LESSEN THE CONFRONTATION THROUGH THESE NEGOTIATIONS AND THINK OUR PROPOSAL FOR A GROUND FORCE COMMON CEILING WOULD ELIMINATE THE DISPARITY THAT CURRENTLY MAKES THOSE FORCES APPEAR TO BE ENGAGED IN "CONFRONTATION."

26. QUESTION: ISN'T IT TRUE THAT EASTERN NEGOTIATORS AND MEDIA OFTEN SINGLE OUT THE FRG AND ITS ARMY AS CONSTITUTING THE MAJOR MILITARY COMPONENT IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS? IS IT CORRECT THAT THE EAST INSISTS ON FRG REDUCTIONS FROM THE START?

ANSWER: YEA, THE EASTERN MEDIA HAVE TRIED TO EMPHASIZE FRG REDUCTIONS. NEGOTIATIONS ON THEIR PARTICIPATION WOULD TAKE PLACE IN PHASE II.

27. QUESTION: ISN'T IT A FACT THAT THE SMOLDERING  
US-EUROPEAN RIFT IMPEDES THE NEGOTIATIONS AND IN A  
SENSE HELPS THE EAST?

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03141 02 OF 02 081922Z

ANSWER: WE WESTERN REPS HERE AT MBFR ARE  
CONSTANTLY ASKED THIS QUESTION AND I AM GLAD TO REPORT  
THAT COHESION AMONG THE ALLIES HERE IN VIENNA HAS BEEN  
EXCELLENT. EVERYTHING WE HAVE DONE AND ARE DOING IN  
THESE NEGOTIATIONS HAS BEEN THE RESULT OF UNANIMOUS  
CONSENSUS.

28. QUESTION: WHAT ABOUT THE REMARKS BY UNITED  
STATES VICE-PRESIDENT FORD ABOUT WESTERN EUROPEAN  
OBSTRUCTIONS TO THE COURSE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS?

ANSWER: I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE HAD IN MIND. I  
CAN SAY THAT THE COOPERATION AND COHESION AMONG THE  
WESTERN ALLIES IS EXEMPLARY.

29. QUESTION: HAS THE EAST SUGGESTED A FREEZE OF  
THE CURRENT LEVELS OF SOME FORCES? ARE YOU WILLING TO

DO THIS?

ANSWER: THERE HAS BEEN NO EXPLICIT PROPOSAL TO  
THIS EFFECT. WE FEEL THAT, IF A SATISFACTORY PHASE I  
AGREEMENT IS REACHED AND CONTAINS A JOINT COMMITMENT TO  
REACH A COMMON CEILING IN THE SECOND PHASE OF NEGOTIATION,  
THERE WOULD BE NO INDUCEMENT TO INCREASE FORCES BETWEEN  
THE PHASES.

30. QUESTION: WHAT ABOUT A FREEZE ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

ANSWER: THE REAL ISSUE IS THE IMBALANCE IN GROUND  
FORCES. IF WE REACH A COMMON CEILING IN GROUND FORCES,  
NO ONE WOULD HAVE AN INCENTIVE TO INCREASE THESE FORCES.

31. QUESTION: WHAT COURSE DO YOU EXPECT THE  
NEGOTIATIONS TO TAKE WHEN THEY RESUME IN MAY?

ANSWER: WE HOPE AND BELIEVE THERE MAY BE SOME  
PROSPECT OF AN AGREEMENT BY 1975. END TEXT. HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN



## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** PRESS RELEASES, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETINGS, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, MEETING PROCEEDINGS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 08 APR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974VIENNA03141  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D740079-0883  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740457/aaaabzyp.tel  
**Line Count:** 379  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 7  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 19 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <19 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <06 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO BE USED BY NETHERLANDS REP QUARLES  
**TAGS:** PARM, NL, NATO, WTO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005